

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the Final Office Action, mailed November 16, 2007, [hereinafter FOA], and request reconsideration. Claims 6 through 10, 15 through 22, 24, 26, 28 through 31 and 36 through 41 remain pending in the application. Claims 6, 16, 19, 22, 24, 26, 36 and 39 are hereby amended.

Claims 6-10, 15-22, 24, 26, 28-31, 36, 38-39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0149988 (published Aug. 7, 2003) by Ellis, et al. [hereinafter “Ellis”]. See FOA, page 5. Claims 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis. See FOA, page 7.

The independent claims 6, 16, 19, 22, 24, 26, 36 and 39, have been amended to include language that was already inherent in the claims, and which better clarifies the scope of the claimed subject matter. Support for the amendments may be found throughout Applicants’ Specification, for example, in U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0133822 (published Sep. 19, 2002), FIG. 7; page 1, ¶ 0015; and page 3, ¶ 0024 to ¶ 0027.

The amended claim language provides that an “*extended electronic program guide is organized as a grid of entries, said grid including a plurality of cells wherein said entries are contained within said cells, each of the cells including the information related to at least one of the current live stream or the future live stream and wherein at least one entry, in at least one cell of said plurality of cells, indicates presence of existent recorded material associated with at least a second entry in said at least one cell, said at least a second entry containing the information related to either the current live stream or the future live stream.*”

Ellis does not teach a program guide having cells with multiple entries, or where there may be a first cell entry with information for a current live stream or future live stream, and a second cell entry, in the same cell, for existing recorded material associated with the first entry.

The independent claims as amended are therefore patentably distinguishable from Ellis. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of independent claims 6, 16, 19, 22, 24, 26, 36 and 39, as amended, is respectfully requested.

As the dependent claims depend from, and include all features of, their corresponding base independent claims, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of all dependent claims is respectfully requested in light of the amended base claims.

Applicants also respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 37 and 40, as Ellis does not disclose all features of these claims as related at least to the independent base claims 36 and 39 as amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 27, 2008

By: /Joseph T. Cygan/
Joseph T. Cygan
Registration No. 50,937

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7945
fax: (312) 609-5005